

REMARKS

Claims 1-7 are pending in this application, of which claims 1-6 have been amended.

Claim 7 has been newly-added.

The Examiner has objected to the Abstract for various informalities. Accordingly, attached hereto is a Substitute Sheet for the Abstract correcting such informalities.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as indefinite.

Accordingly, claims 1-6 have been amended to correct the noted instances of indefiniteness. Further, claim 7 has been newly-added.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-5 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. 2002/0069365 to Howard et al. (hereafter, "**Howard et al.**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Howard et al. discloses a limited-use browser and related security system control access to content stored on a server computer linked to a network. The security system secures the content on the server and only permits it to be downloaded to a client computer running the limited-user browser or a general purpose browser executing an add-in security module providing the same functions as the limited-user browser. The limited-use browser or module secures the downloaded content on the client computer and displays it in a "view-only" module. While the secured content is being displayed, menu selections, key combination, or pointing device commands initiated on the client computer that would modify the content or create a copy on another medium are either disabled as a default or monitored to determine if the action is

permitted.

The Examiner has urged, among other things, that paragraphs [0039] and [0042] disclose that the play back software is set such that it permits the play back of the contents file only when the client ID thereof agrees with the client ID incorporated in the contents file.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Paragraph [0042] discloses:

In the present example, the content provider has used the individual security models to secure the pages on a web site. A user of the client computer 311 requests 313 as document 303 from the server 301 through the limited-use browser 312. The browser 312 sends a client key 314 to the server computer 301, either as a part of the request 313 or via socket communication as is well known in the art. When the user request 313 is received by the server computer 301, the server component 302 determines if a client key is associated with the request. If the key 314 is not present, the request is immediately rejected.

This passage fails to disclose that the client key 314 (presumably corresponding to the client ID), is incorporated into the contents file (presumably corresponding to document 303), as required in claims 1 and 4 of the instant application.

Thus, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection should be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-7, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.


If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

U.S. Patent Application Serial No. **10/088,488**
Response to Office Action dated March 23, 2006

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP


William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/ak
Atty. Docket No. **020392**
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Substitute Abstract of the Disclosure

Q:\HOME\AKERR\WLB\02\020392\amendment JUNE 2006